DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 157 HE 013 267

AUTHOR Hughes, Robert, Jr.: And Others
TITLE Coping Behavior Patterns of College Women.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 30p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Montreal, Canada, September 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement: Affective Behavior: Aggression: Behavioral Science Research: *College Students: *Coping: Education Majors: *Females: Higher Education: Interpersonal Competence: Measurement Techniques: *Personality Measures: Personality Traits: *Problem Solving: *Psychological Characteristics: Questionnaires: Stress Variables: Student Adjustment

ABSTRACT

A process theory of coping developed largely by Robert F. Peck (one of the authors), a sentence completion instrument, and data concerning the manner in which college women cope are considered. Peck proposes that a person going through optimal coping confronts the problem, attempts one or several types of activities in order to resolve the situation, persists in obtaining a solution, and generally resolves the problem in an effective and self-satisfying manner. A semi-projective instrument consisting of 34 sentences that pose the following five types of problems was developed: achievement, interpersonal relations, authority, aggression, and anxiety. The instrument is scored by categorizing the responses according to dimensions such as overt problem solving, emotional expressiveness, aggressive response, and attempt to control affect. The categories are then evaluatively scaled on the dimensions of confrontation, engagement, and coping effectiveness. To assess coping in adults with this instrument, a group of college women, mostly junior and senior education majors, were asked to complete the instrument on two occasions five weeks apart, as well as to complete questionnaires about achievement motivation, personality characteristics, and their interpersonal interaction style. It was found that the instrument is reliable and has utility for the assessment of coping. Additionally, it was found that women who were pursuing a somewhat typical female occupational goal (elementary and secondary school teaching) demonstrate a broad range of coping, from highly adaptive problem solving to marginal adaptation, noncoping, or avoidance, denial. Good copers exhibited work values associated with high achievement, and personality characteristics such as internal locus of control. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED2051157

HE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

COPING BEHAVIOR PATTERNS OF COLLEGE WOMEN*

Robert Hughes, Jr., Glen Payne, Robert F. Peck and John Breeding

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Perhaps one of the most important determinants of adjustment is how one manages everyday stressful events. Investigators over the past twenty years have explored the various ways that college students meet the demands of their environment (Kjerulff & Wiggins, 1976; Lerman, 1979; Mechanic, 1962; Silber, Hamburg, Coelho, Murphey, Rosenburg, & Pearlin, 1961). The study of coping in college students has exhibited many of the same problems that have appeared elsewhere in the study of coping. There is little agreement as to precisely what is meant by coping and how best to assess the construct. The following presentation will discuss a process-theory of coping developed largely by Robert F. Peck, present information regarding the development of an instrument, and particularly address some data concerning the manner in which college women cope.

Most of the coping research has been directed toward the understanding of what happens to people when catastrophic events occur such as major illnesses, natural disasters, etc. While this work has revealed much about the resources of persons, it has done little to explore our understanding of how people manage everyday stresses and strains. Recently several researchers (Folkman & Lazarus, in press; Pearlin & Schooler,

HE 014 263

* Symposium, G. Payne (Chair), College Student Coping: Review and Update, presented at the annual meetings of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, September, 1980.

1978) have begun to explore the everyday types of stress. Folkman and Lazarus (in press) have explored both the causes of stress and the methods used by middle-aged adults to combat the stress. Likewise, Pearlin and Schooler (1978) explored the ways in which people meet the challenges presented in work and interpersonal relations. Both of these studies indicate the need to explore normative stress more thoroughly.

Also, much of the coping research has been focused on particular traits that help to make a person withstand stress (c.f. Lazarus, 1978). Recent theoretical advances indicate the need for researchers to consider a more process-oriented conception of the coping with an emphasis on the transactions between the person and situations (Coyne & Lazarus, in press).

Considering Lazarus' conception of coping there are two broad phases. The first consists of appraisal of the stressful event. Several decades of research by Lazarus and his colleagues (see Lazarus, 1978 for review) have demonstrated the importance of this appraisal phase to stress management. The second phase has received less attention until recently but consists of what the person does following the initial assessment of the situation, that is, now that the person recognizes that some problem exists, what resources does he or she possess to manage the situation. Lazarus has called this phase secondary appraisal. It is this portion of the coping sequence that is the heart of the matter; it is at this point that those who successfully manage the stress are distinguished from those who fail.

In consideration of this problem management phase, Peck (1967; 1979) has suggested an optimal coping strategy that describes a sequence of steps through which persons proceed in the resolution of a problem situation. The person going through the optimal coping process, confronts the problem, attempts one or several types of activities in order to resolve the situation, persists in obtaining a solution and generally resolves the problem in an effective and self-satisfying manner. Similar to other problem-solving conceptions of mental health (e.g., Jahoda, 1958), success is linked to the person's use of this type of strategy rather than simply to a successful outcome. That is, those people who use this type of confronting, engaging, persisting approach to problems will generally be more healthy.

In response to the need for a clearer understanding of normative stress and the theoretical necessity of a process-oriented conception of coping which focuses on what people do about the stressful situation, an instrument was developed to assess this coping process. The instrument is a semi-projective test consisting of thirty-four (34) sentences that pose one of five types of problems. The problem areas are achievement, interpersonal relations, authority, aggression, and anxiety. Table 1 gives examples of items in each of the areas. In each case the participant is asked to write how he/she would manage the situation.

This instrument is scored by categorizing the responses into one of thirty-five (35) possible types of answers. These categories consist of such things as overt problem solving, emotional expressiveness, aggressive response, attempt to control affect, etc. Table 2 gives examples of some of the categories. Following this procedure, the

categories are then evaluatively scaled on the dimensions of confrontation, engagement, and coping effectiveness. For example, in achievement, responses such as "try and get the work done" would receive high scores on all three dimensions whereas "feel bad" would get low scores. These scale scores can then be used to compute sum scores for each behavior area and overall scores can be on confrontation, engagement, and coping effectiveness. Additionally, a frequency count is done so as to determine a coping style score on each of the five dimensions. These include: Solver -- attempts to correct the problem situation, Non-copers-- avoiding,procrastinating the situation or other non-problem related actions, Control of Affect -- attempts to alleviate negative emotions, Aggression -- verbal and physical attacks on persons, objects or self, Expression of Affect -- expressions of anger or anxiety in the face of the problem situation.

In a first attempt to assess coping in adults with this instrument a group of college women, mostly junior and senior Education majors, were selected for study. This group of women was asked to complete this instrument on two occasions, five weeks apart, as well as to complete questionnaires about achievement motivation (Work & Family Orientation), personality characteristics (Views of Life), and their interpersonal interaction style (Structural Analysis of Social Behavior). Grade Point Averages were also obtained.

Initially, the reliability of the instrument was examined. (See Table 3.) A reliability of 87.5% was obtained by two coders of the data after several revisions of the coding manual. In regard to internal consistency, the overall confrontation, engagement, and coping effectiveness

scores were .65, .64, and .71. The internal consistency for each behavior area was .79, .76, .76, .74, and .77. Test-retest reliability for the overall scores was .66, .69, and .71 for confrontation, engagement and coping effectiveness, respectively. And the test-retest reliabilities were .14, .37, .65, .46, and .52 for each of the five behavior areas, achievement, interpersonal relations, authority, anxiety, and aggression, respectively. Test-retest reliability for coping styles was .59, .37, .77, .70, and .68 for Solver, Non-coping, Control of Affect, Expressive of Affect, and Aggression. While the test-retest scores for the behavior areas are somewhat weak, these scores represent some reasonable hope considering the homogenous population and the relatively few items per scale.

In addition to the reliability, the correlations of these scores with those from the other instruments offer some insight into the utility and explanatory value of this instrument. It was hypothesized that those college women who coped well would show success in school and would have achievement values in terms of mastery and work; and that they would place value on work rather than money or power, and would have high educational aspirations. They should also have an internal sense of control, high self-esteem and be self-initiating. In terms of interactional style, these people would be expected to be affiliative and autonomous in their relationships. The results to be presented bear out many of these hypotheses.

In Table 4 one finds the correlations between the types of achievement motivation and the coping scores. In this Table it can be seen that coping styles are related to achievement motivation. As predicted,

high solver scores are positively correlated with mastery and hard work orientation. Likewise, non-coping scores are negatively correlated with the mastery and work orientations. The competitive orientation is correlated positively with aggression and expression of affect and negatively with control of affect and non-coping. High scores on aggression are also negatively correlated with concern about the negative impact of achievement on personal relationships. The total confrontation, engagement and coping effectiveness scores are related to mastery but only marginally. It is also somewhat surprising that coping with task achievement was not more highly related to mastery and work.

In Table 5 the correlations among several attitudes toward work and family are presented. These appear highly related to coping and provide some insight into the value systems of good copers. The pattern of findings across all of the variables is quite similar. In general, valuing prestige and good pay for self or spouse are negatively correlated with good coping. Also, the more children desired, the less the coping effectiveness. Those values that are positively correlated with coping are high educational aspirations and valuing career over family. These values indicate that those women who cope well are not particularly oriented toward money or prestige, but do value work and pursuing an education.

Further exploration of the coping styles and these attitudes is presented in Table 6. The solver style again is correlated with educational aspirations and valuing work over family and negatively correlated with the desire for prestige or money. The control of affect

style has similar correlations in regard to prestige and money, but is not positively correlated with the aspirations or valuing of work. The aggressive style is positively correlated with the desire for prestige for both self and spouse and with the desire for spouse to have a well-paying job. The most interesting contrast is the exact opposite relationships for the expressive style of coping. Those persons with high scores on expression of affect as a style of coping had high scores on the desire for spouse to have a prestigious and well paying job and was marginally related to having a well paying job themselves. These persons also wanted more children, tended to have lower educational aspirations and valued family over work. The expression of affect style could be called the "traditional" female response to stress. It is interesting to note that the attitudes and values of these persons also seem to fit a traditional pattern.

The relationship between personality variables and coping was also assessed. These results appear in Tables 7 and 8. Coping was generally expected to be positively related to these personality dimensions. While the results in Table 7 indicated this was generally the case, there was not as much relationship as might be expected. The relationship between the coping scores in each behavior area and the personality measures was strongest for interpersonal relations and task achievement. Those persons who coped well with others had an internal locus of control, confronted rather than avoided problems and initiated action toward the resolution of a problem. They preferred to do something rather than fantasize about a situation and they expressed their feelings.

Additionally, they had high self-esteem and derived satisfaction from mastery. They did not exhibit the characteristics of intellectually solving problems. Those persons who coped well with achievement initiated solutions to problems, attacked the problem directly, and were self-starters. These persons also had high self-esteem, believed the world was complex and derived satisfaction from mastery. For the total coping scores the most notable relationships were the correlations of internal locus of control, instrumentality, and satisfaction from mastery with each of the coping dimensions of confrontation, engagement and coping effectiveness. Table 8 illustrates the relationship among the personality characteristics and the coping styles. It is interesting to note the contrast between the solver and expression of affect styles. Those persons with high solver scores had high internal locus of control scores whereas the expression of affect style was negatively correlated. The instrumentality-fantasy dimension was also positively related to solver and negatively related to expression of affect indicating that solvers were now oriented toward the problem and the affective reactors were more likely to fantasize. Solvers were more likely to control affect and one might expect the expressers were more likely to express their affect. Solvers received higher scores than the expressive styled persons on satisfaction from mastery. These results again point out the opposite reactions and approaches taken by persons with these different styles of coping.

Coping and achievement were also compared. Table 9 shows the correlation between GPA and the coping scores. The most surprising

finding was the lack of correlation between the total coping scores and GPA. Also, coping with task achievement and GPA was not significantly related. The solver style, however, was significantly correlated. This lack of significant relationships may be due to the restricted range of the grades or possibly their lack of true representativeness of these persons' achievement levels. Further research is needed to clarify this relationship.

The relationship between coping and interpersonal styles of social behavior are presented in Tables 10, 11, and 12. Table 10 shows the relationship of the total coping scores to the various dimensions of interpersonal relationships. It was expected that those people with high affiliation and autonomy scores would be good copers. The correlations for affiliation and coping bear this out, but the autonomy scores are not correlated with coping. Whether one is dominant or submissive appears unrelated to coping. Looking at social interaction, those aspects that are high on affiliation, such as encourages friendly autonomy and friendly influence, are positively related to coping and those aspects that are low on affiliation, invoke hostile autonomy and hostile power are negatively correlated with coping. A similar pattern of findings is evident in Table 11, especially in the interpersonal relations and authority areas. As might be expected, coping in task achievement is unrelated to interpersonal styles. In Table 12 the coping style variables and their relationship to interpersonal styles are shown. The solver style is quite similar to the previous coping variables with affiliation being strongly related. The expression of

affect style shows a generally opposite pattern of results in comparison to the solver dimension. Affiliation is negatively correlated with high scores on this style. Oppressing self and invoking hostile autonomy or power are positively related to expression of affect. One could speculate that this type of expressivity tends to evoke anger and frustration in others. The other styles of non-coping, control of affect and aggression each show their own unique pattern of relationships with interpersonal style factors.

The results of this study indicate the utility of the Sentence Completion instrument for the assessment of coping. The scores are reasonably stable and internally consistent indicating that the instrument obtains at least the minimal requirements for psychological assessment. Additionally, the data provide some insight into the coping styles of college women. While those women are pursuing a somewhat typical female occupational goal, elementary and secondary school teaching, their coping behavior indicates that these women present a broad range of coping, from highly adaptive problem solving to marginal adaptation, non-coping, or avoidance, denial, etc. It is interesting to note that the good copers exhibit work values associated with high achievement, and personality characteristics, such as internal locus of control, that are generally related to good adjustment. The contrasting patterns of results between the solver and expressive orientation suggests the need to explore further the causes and consequences of the failure to deal rationally with problems. This study lays the groundwork for the further exploration of coping and its relationship to successful adjustment.

References

Coyne, J.C., & Lazarus, R.S. Cognition, stress, and coping. In I.L. Kutash & L.B. Schlesinger (Eds.), Pressure Point: Perspectives on stress and anxiety. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, in press.

Folkman, S. & Lazarus, R.S. An analysis of coping in a middle-aged community sample. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, in press.

Jahoda, M. Current concepts of positive mental health. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Lazarus, R.S. The stress and coping paradism. Paper presented at conference entitled "The Critical Evaluation of Behavioral Paradigms for Psychiatric Science. Gleneden Beach, Oregon, November, 1978.

Lerman, C.A. Relationship of Stressors, cognitions, and coping strategies to depression in a university population. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1979.

Mechanic, D. Students under stress. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Pearlin, L.I., & Schooler, C. The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1978, 19, 2-21.

Peck, R.F. Coping styles: A conceptualization of effective behavior. Proceedings of the IX Inter-American Congress of Psychology, 1967, 1.

Peck, R.F. Coping behavior and achievement: An International study. Technical Report: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1977.

Silber, E., Hamburg, D.A., Coelho, G.V., Murphey, E.B., Rosenburg, M., & Pearlin, L.I. Adaptive behavior in competent adolescents: Coping with the antiticpation of college. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1961, 5, 354 - 365.

COPING BEHAVIOR PATTERNS OF COLLEGE WOMEN*

Summary and Tables**

Robert Hughes, Jr., Glen Payne, Robert F. Peck, and
John Breeding
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

---

* Symposium, G. Payne, Chair, College Student Coping: Review and Update, presented at the annual meetings of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, September, 1980.

** Complete paper available upon request from the above authors.

COPING BEHAVIOR PATTERN OF COLLEGE WOMEN

Several excellent studies have been done which describe the competent, effective behavior that students use to adapt to college (Silber, Hamburg, Coelho, Murphey, Rosenburg, & Pearlin, 1961; Chickering, 1969). In these studies researchers have found that the academic and interpersonal aspects of college are the troublesome areas for most students. Semi-projective methods and interviews have been the most frequently used instruments in these studies, yet Coelho et. al.,(1969) have noted that a need exists for improved instruments to measure student coping behavior patterns.

Peck and associates (1979), who have extensively measured the coping behavior of school children, recently revised their instruments to measure college student coping. Five problem areas of college life -- task achievement, interpersonal relations, relations with authority, aggression, and anxiety -- were chosen for study. Students' effectiveness at handling these problems was measured by an Adult Sentence Completion instrument. The reliability of this instrument was assessed and this coping measure was validated with measures of (1) academic achievement (GPA), (2) achievement motivation (Work and Family Orientation Questinnaire), (3) personality characteristics (Views of Life), and (4) social interaction style (Structural Analysis of Social Behavior).

College women, mostly junior and senior Education majors, were the participants in this study. Through a series of planned correlations coping behavior patterns were related to the other measures.

The results of this study indicate the utility of the Sentence Completion instrument for the assessment of coping. The scores are reasonably stable and internally consistent indicating that the instrument obtains at least the minimal requirements for psychological assessment. Additionally, the data provide some insight into the coping styles of college women. While those women are pursuing a somewhat typical female occupational goal, elementary and secondary school teaching, their coping behavior indicates that these women present a broad range of coping, from highly adaptive problem solving to marginal adaptation, non-coping, or avoidance, denial, etc. It is interesting to note that the good copers exhibit work values associated with high achievement, and personality characteristics, such as internal locus of control, that are generally related to good adjustment. The contrasting patterns of results between the solver and expressive orientation suggests the need to explore further the causes and consequences of the failure to deal rationally with problems. This study lays the groundwork for the further exploration of coping and its relationship to successful adjustment.

Table 1

STEMS OF BEHAVIOR AREA

Coping Stems

A. Authority

6. When I am closely supervised, I
9. If my boss criticized me, I
12. When someone gives me an order, I
32. When I'm put under pressure, I
33. When my boss (teacher) and I disagree, I

B. Interpersonal Relationships

3. If I couldn't agree with fellow workers about what to do, I
16. When someone I know ignores me, I
17. If one of my friends is mad at me, I
25. When I'm with people I don't know, I
27. When the person I'm closest to gets unhappy with me, I

C. Aggression

8. When I get mad, I
19. When someone I'm working with makes me angry, I
21. When someone is rude to me, I
28. When somebody gives me a raw deal, I
31. When I lose my temper, I

D. Task Achievement

2. When there is something difficult to do, I
7. When work gets frustrating, I
13. If I haven't finished a job on time, I
15. When we are not getting the results we should at work, I
24. When other people seem to do better work than I do, I

E. Anxiety

4. When I get depressed, I
11. When I get worried, I
20. If I have a lot of problems that make me nervous, I
23. When it looks as if nothing is going to work out, I
29. When something makes me anxious, I

Table 2

COPING STEM CONTENT CATEGORIES

Category Description

Attempt to Resolve Interpersonal Problems with Appropriate Individual(s) Concerned.
Attempt to Make Amends or Exert Calming or Soothing Influence Upon Another.
Ideational Problem-Solving Behavior.
Other Overt Problem-Solving Behavior.
Request for Aid or Advice
Desire to do Better or to Excel
Simple Compliance
Compliance Plus Additional Effort or Enthusiasm
Conditional Compliance
Unwilling Compliance
Passive Acceptance/No Reaction
Helpless, Uncertain, Confused, Overwhelmed
Physical or Emotional Withdrawal
Refusal or Probable Refusal
Dysfunctional Substitute or Compensatory Activity Pursued
Religious Responses
Covert Control of Negative Affect
Overt Behaviors Designed to Control Negative Affect
Physical Attack Upon a Person
Verbal Aggression
Undifferentiated or Displaced Aggression
Passive Aggression
Standing Firm or Active Defense
Negative Hostile or Aggressive Affect
Negative Depressive or Anxious Affect
Combination of Negative Affect and Positive Attitude
Combination of Negative Affect and Positive Behavior
Positive Affect
Physiological or Involuntary Responses
Procrastination
Socially Undesirable Behavior
Rationalization
Self-Assessed Poor Performance
Self-Assessed Mediocre Performance
Self-Assessed Good Performance
Stimulus Resistant Responses

Table 3

RELIABILITIES OF SENTENCE COMPLETION

Interrater Reliability: 87.5

	Internal Consistency	Test-Retest Reliability
Total Coping Scores		
Confront	.65	.66
Engagement	.64	.69
Coping Effectiveness	.71	.71
Behavior Areas		
Achievement	.79	.14
Interpersonal Relations	.76	.37
Authority	.76	.65
Anxiety	.74	.46
Aggression	.77	.52

Table 4

Correlations Between Work And Family Orientation
And Sentence Completion

	Work and Family Orientation			
Coping Styles	Mastery	Work	Competition	Personal Unconcern
Solver	.22*	.17*		
Control of Affect			-.20*	
Aggression			.24**	-.18*
Non-Coping	-.16*	-.24**	-.15[m]	
Expressive of Affect			.14[m]	
Factor Scores				
Coping with Anxiety				
Coping with Interpersonal Relations	.20*			
Coping with Authority				
Coping with Task Achievement		.13[m]		
Coping with Aggression				
Total Coping Scores				
Confront	.13[m]			
Engagement	.15[m]			
Coping-Effectiveness	.16[m]			

[m] = $p < .10$
* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Table 5

Correlations between Sentence Completion (Factor and Total Scores)
and
Attitudes toward Work and Family

Attitudes	Coping with Anxiety	Coping with IPR	Coping with Authority	Coping with Task Achievement	Coping with Aggression	Confront	Engagement	Coping Effectiveness
Desire for Advancement				-.16*				
Desire for Spouse to have well paying job	-.21*	-.23**			-.31***	-.26**	-.21**	-.26**
Personal Desire for Well Paying Job	-.23**	-.15^{m}				-.24**	-.16*	-.22**
Spouse to have Prestigious Job		-.18*		-.15^{m}	-.30***	-.17*	-.13^{m}	-.21**
Personal Desire for Prestige		-.19*			-.22*	-.14^{m}		-.17*
Unconcerned about Spouse with Better Job	-.16^{m}							
Educational Aspiration	.16^{m}		.31***	.14^{m}	.16^{m}	.22**	.21**	.25**
Relation of Work to Family	.14^{m}	.18*	.16^{m}	.13^{m}	.19*	.19*	.22**	.19*
Number of Children Desired		-.28**			-.23**	-.23**	-.24**	-.20*

^{m} = $p < .10$
* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$
*** = $p < .001$

Table 6

Correlations Between Sentence Completion (Coping Style)

and

Attitudes toward Work and Family

	Coping Style				
Attitudes	Solver	Non-Coping	Control of Affect	Aggression	Expressive of Affect
Desire for Advancement					
Desire for Spouse to have well paying job	-.28**	.12[m]	-.29***	.23**	.25**
Personal Desire for Well Paying Job	-.24**		-.14[m]		.14[m]
Spouse to have Prestigious Job	-.18*		-.21**	.24**	.22**
Personal Desire for Prestige	-.16*		-.19*	.23**	
Unconcerned about Spouse with Better Job					
Educational Aspiration	.21**	-.17*			-.19*
Relation of Work to Family	.20*				-.24**
Number of Children Desired	-.24**			-.15[m]	.24**

[m] = $p < .10$

* = $p < .05$

** = $p < .01$

*** = $p < .001$

Table 7

Correlation of Sentence Completion

and

Views of Life

	Factor Scores					Total Coping Scores		
	Coping with Anxiety	Coping with IPR	Coping with Author-ity	Coping with Task Achieve-ment	Coping with Aggres-sion	Confront	Engage-ment	Coping Effec-tive-ness
Locus of Control	.21*	.17*				.17*	.16[m]	.20*
Confront-Avoid		.24**	-.13[m]		.15[m]			
Self-Other Initiation		.13[m]		.15[m]	.19*		.14[m]	.16*
Self-Other Solver								
Self-Other Implemen-tation								
Instrumentality - Fantasy	.16[m]	.22*		.27**		.27**	.29**	.29**
Independence -Obedience	-.19*					-.18*		
Intrinsic-Extrinsic Motivation			.16[m]					
Earned-Bestowed Status								
Control-Expressivity of Affect		.23**				.14[m]		.13[m]
Self-Esteem		.14[m]		.15[m]				
State of Reality				.14[m]				
Self-Starter				.17*				
Intellectual Solver		-.22*						
Self-Solver								
Satisfaction from Mastery		.25**		.20*		.23**	.24**	.25**
Total Coping Score				.17*				

[m] = $p < .10$ * = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$

Table 8

Correlations between Sentence Completion

and

Views of Life

	Coping Style				
	Solver	Non-Coping	Control	Aggression	Affect
Locus of Control	.28**	-.14^{m}			-.15^{m}
Confront-Avoid	.15^{m}				
Self-Other Initiation	.19*				
Self-Other Solver					
Self-Other Implementation			-.16*	.14^{m}	
Instrumentality -Fantasy	.27**				-.23**
Independence -Obedience		.15^{m}	-.16*		
Intrinsic-Extrinsic Motivation					
Earned-Bestowed Status					.13^{m}
Control-Expressivity of Affect	.14^{m}				-.13^{m}
Self-Esteem		-.15^{m}	.23**		
State of Reality					
Self-Starter	.15^{m}	-.15^{m}			
Intellectual Solver					.13^{m}
Self-Solver			-.13^{m}	.18*	
Satisfaction from Mastery	.21*		.17*	-.15^{m}	-.20*
Total Coping Score					

^{m} = $p < .10$ * = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$

Table 9

Correlations Between Sentence Completion
And Grade Point Average

	Grade Point Average	p
Coping Style		
Solver	.20	.02*
Control of Affect	-.17	.04*
Aggression	.15	.05*
Non-Coping	ns	
Expressive of Affect	ns	
Factor Scores		
Coping with Anxiety	.16	.06[m]
Coping with Interpersonal Relations	ns	
Coping with Authority	ns	
Coping with Task Achievement	ns	
Coping with Aggression	.19	.03*
Total Coping Scores		
Confront	ns	
Engagement	ns	
Coping Effectiveness	ns	

---

[m] = $p < .10$

* = $p < .05$

ns = Not significant

Table 10

Correlations between Sentence Completion (Total Coping Scores) and Structural Analysis of Social Behavior

Other Focuses on Me	TOTAL COPING SCORES		
	Confront	Engagement	Coping Effectiveness
Encourage Friendly Autonomy	.21*	.18*	.23**
Invoke Hostile Autonomy	-.36***	-.28**	-.37***
Hostile Power	-.19*	-.13[m]	-.20*
Friendly Influence	.21*	.20*	.24**
Affiliation	.32***	.24**	.34***
Autonomy			
Other Focuses on Self			
Enjoy Friendly Autonomy	.20*	.15[m]	.19*
Take Hostile Autonomy	-.31***	-.27**	-.34***
Friendly Accept			
Affiliation	.29***	.23**	.31***
Autonomy			
I Focus on Other			
Encourage Friendly Autonomy	.16**		.14[m]
Invoke Hostile Autonomy			
Hostile Power			
Friendly Influence	.14[m]	.15[m]	.16*
Affiliation	.22*	.18*	.22*
Autonomy			
I Focus on Self			
Enjoy Friendly Autonomy	.15[m]		
Take Hostile Autonomy	-.19*	-.14[m]	-.20*
Hostile Comply	-.14[m]		
Friendly Accept			
Affiliation	.26**	.18*	.24**
Autonomy			

[m] = $p < .10$ * = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$ *** = $p < .001$

Table 11

Correlations between Sentence Completion (Factor Scores) and Structural Analysis of Social Behavior

	FACTOR SCORES				
Self Concept	Coping with Anxiety	Coping with IPR	Coping with Authority	Coping with Task Achievement	Coping with Aggression
Accept; enjoy self	.22*	.15[m]			
Reject Self					
Oppress Self		-.14[m]			
Manage, cultivate self	.21*				-.17*
Affiliation	.19*	.15[m]			
Autonomy					
Other Focuses on Me					
Encourage Friendly Autonomy	.19*	.27**			
Invoke Hostile Autonomy	-.22*	-.38***	-.27**		
Hostile Power		-.24**	-.24**		
Friendly Influence	.19*	.23*			
Affiliation	.23*	.36**	.25**		
Autonomy					
Other Focuses on Self					
Enjoy Friendly Autonomy	.19*	.26**			
Take Hostile Autonomy	-.14[m]	-.34***	-.36***		-.19*
Hostile Comply		-.13[m]	-.30***		-.16[m]
Friendly Accept		.13[m]	-.18*		
Affiliation	.17*	.36***	.25**		.15[m]
Autonomy			.15[m]		
I Focus on Other					
Encourage Friendly Autonomy		.14[m]			
Invoke Hostile Autonomy		.19*	-.16[m]		
Hostile Power		-.24**	-.17*		
Friendly Influence		.20*			
Affiliation		.30***	.22*		
Autonomy					

Table 11 (continued)

Correlations between Sentence Completion (Factor Scores) and Structural Analysis of Social Behavior

	FACTOR SCORES				
I Focus on Self	Coping with Anxiety	Coping with IPR	Coping with Authority	Coping with Task Achievement	Coping with Aggression
Enjoy Friendly Autonomy		.17*			
Take Hostile Autonomy		-.33***	-.19*		
Hostile Comply		-.14^{m}			-.15^{m}
Friendly Accept Affiliation		.33***	.15^{m}		.13^{m}
Autonomy					

^{m} = $p < .10$

* = $p < .05$

** = $p < .01$

*** = $p < .001$

Table 12

Correlations between Sentence Completion (Coping Style) and Structural Analysis of Social Behavior

	COPING STYLE				
Self Concept	Solver	Non-Coping	Control of Affect	Aggression	Expressive of Affect
Accept; enjoy self			.24**		-.18*
Reject Self				-.16*	
Oppress Self				-.17*	.23**
Manage, cultivate self				.14^{m}	
Affiliation			.18*	.18*	-.20*
Autonomy					-.20*
Other Focuses on Me					
Encourage Friendly Autonomy	.24**				-.13^{m}
Invoke Hostile Autonomy	-.38***	.20*			.27**
Hostile Power	-.28**	.13^{m}		-.15^{m}	.17*
Friendly Influence	.15^{m}		.15^{m}	-.15^{m}	-.14^{m}
Affiliation	.34***	-.13^{m}			-.25**
Autonomy			-.29***	.17*	
Other Focuses on Self					
Enjoy Friendly Autonomy	.21**				-.18*
Take Hostile Autonomy	-.33***				.22*
Hostile Comply	-.20*		.15^{m}		
Friendly Accept					
Affiliation	.33***				-.18*
Autonomy		.13^{m}	-.16*	.19*	
I Focus on Other					
Encourage Friendly Autonomy	.14^{m}				
Invoke Hostile Authority	-.20*				
Hostile Power	-.19*				.13^{m}
Friendly Influence			.26**	-.19*	
Affiliation	.22**				-.14^{m}
Autonomy	.15^{m}		-.25**	.21*	

Table 12 (continued)

Correlations between Sentence Completion (Coping Style) and Structural Analysis of Social Behavior

	COPING STYLE				
I Focus on Self	Solver	Non-Coping	Control of Affect	Aggression	Expressive of Affect
Enjoy Friendly Autonomy				.18*	
Take Hostile Autonomy	-.27**	.17*			
Hostile Comply	-.15^{m}			-.25**	.16^{m}
Friendly Accept Affiliation	.27**	-.20*		.16^{m}	-.17*
Autonomy				.28**	-.14^{m}

^{m} - $p < .10$

* = $p < .05$

** = $p < .01$

*** = $p < .001$

Table 13

Correlations Among Sentence Completion Variables

	Coping Styles				
Coping Styles	Solver	Control of Affect	Aggression	Non-Coping	Expressive of Affect
Solver		-.03	-.08	-.43***	-.60***
Control of Affect			-.33***	.03	.37***
Aggression				.03	.01
Non-Coping					-.06
Expressive of Affect					
Factor Scores					
Coping with Anxiety	.51***	.36***	.00	-.16^{m}	-.72***
Coping with Interpersonal Relations	.72***	.06	.00	-.25**	-.61***
Coping with Authority	.53***	.09	-.21*	-.16*	-.52***
Coping with Task Achievement	.49***	.19*	-.14^{m}	-.28**	-.53***
Coping with Aggression	.57***	.13^{m}	-.24**	-.11	-.51***
Total Coping Scores					
Confront	.83***	.28**	-.02	-.38***	-.79***
Engagement	.82***	.14^{m}	-.16*	-.39***	-.69***
Coping-Effectiveness	.88***	.23**	-.20*	-.36***	-.80***

^{m} = $p < .10$

* = $p < .05$

** = $p < .01$

*** = $p < .001$